H

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,590	03/14/2000	Philip R Krause	READ-REL-CIP-031400	8636

	EXAMINER
35197 7590 06/16/2004	NGUYEN, CHAU T

PHILIP R KRAUSE
9437 SEVEN LOCKS RD
BETHESDA, MD 20817

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 April 2004*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *36-69* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *36-69* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Amendment, received on April 30, 2004, has been entered. Claims 36-69 are

presented for examination.

2.   Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last

Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to new claims 36-69 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

5.   Claims 36-41 and 43-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sotomayor, Patent No. 5,708,825 and further in view of Meske, Jr. et

al. (Meske), Patent No. 5,530,852.

6.   As to claims 36, 68 and 69, Sotomayor discloses a method for using a computer

system, in response to a reader's request for display of electronic text, to automatically

identify and provide additional reading material related to concepts referred to within

said electronic text comprising, in sequence, the steps of:

        a) accessing, using the reader's computer, electronic text requested for display

        by the reader, said electronic text containing at least one text section (col. 5, line

        53 – col. 7, line 10: a viewer viewing documents uses a web browser to access

        the documents that a database provider may make available on the network,

        each document might have plurality of pages, and each page contains a portion

        of a source document);

        c) automatically searching an index, wherein

                i) said index contains a plurality of terms by which it may be searched (col.

                3, line 41 – col. 4, line 8);

                ii) substantially all terms in said index are associated with at least one

                pointer to a text section (col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 8 and col. 15, lines 48-

                67 and Abstract); and

iii) at least one term in said index is associated with a plurality of pointers,

at least two of said plurality of pointers pointing to different text sections

(col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 21) ;

Sotomayor provides viewer with an indexed and/or hyperlinked view of a

document wherein a view can view and search for text strings having important key

topics marked and indexed (col. 35, lines 48-57).   However, Sotomayor does not

explicitly disclose b) using said at least one text section to automatically formulate, on

the reader's computer, a search request related to a concept referred to in said at least

one text section; d) responsive to step (c), automatically identifying additional reading

material related to said concept; and e) automatically displaying on said reader's

computer display, an indicator of said additional reading material together with at least

one link to a source of said additional reading material, side-by-side with a portion of the

electronic text referred to in step (a).   Meske Jr. discloses a method for retrieving

information by displaying to a user a display generated from a first markup language

containing a list of profiles and at least one corresponding topic for each of the list of

profiles and allowed user to enter search term, and the search is performed using the

search term in a database which is organized by the list of the profiles and the at lest

one corresponding topic for each of the list of profiles (col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 8).

Meske Jr. also discloses the search result may also create certain HTML files

responsive to user search requests and additional HTML files created responsive

thereto, wherein anchors are created in the various files in order to allow hypertext

cross-referencing of the various related file and/or documents (col. 5, lines 58 – col. 7, line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meske Jr. and Sotomayor to include using said at least one text section to automatically formulate, on the reader's computer, a search request related to a concept referred to in said at least one text section; automatically identifying additional reading material related to said concept; and automatically displaying on said reader's computer display, an indicator of said additional reading material together with at least one link to a source of said additional reading material, side-by-side with a portion of the electronic text referred. Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing.

7.   As to claim 37, Sotomayor and Meske Jr. (Sotomayor-Meske) disclose wherein said additional reading material of step d is accessible over a network (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

8.   As to claim 38, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said network is the internet (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

9.   As to claim 39, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises selecting certain words from said text section, wherein said index includes words present in other text sections, and wherein said additional reading material contains all words in said search request (Meske, Figs. 8 and 9, col. 10, line 41 – col. 11, line 5: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

10.   As to claim 40, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing said text section for the presence of combinations of certain words in a specific order and within a specified proximity of one another wherein said index includes words from other text sections, and wherein said additional reading material contains the same combinations of certain words in said specific order and within said specified proximity of one another (Sotomayor, col. 4, lines 11-48; Meske, col. 5, line 58 – col. 6, line 14).

11.   As to claim 41, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing said text section for patterns of word usage that are recognized by the computer system to relate to a concept (Sotomayor, col. 4, lines 10-21).

12.   As to claim 43, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing said text section for citation of references, and wherein said additional reading material cites at least one source cited by said text section (Meske, col. 11, lines 11-29).

13.   As to claim 44, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing said text section for embedded commands (Sotomayor, col. 6, lines 18-48).

14.   As to claim 45, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises statistical analysis of word usage within said text section (Sotomayor, col. 15, lines 48 – 67).

15.   As to claim 46, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises identifying an index entry referring to said text section (Sotomayor, col. 15, lines 48-67).

16.   As to claim 47, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said search request is contained in a list of potential search terms (Sotomayor, col. 15, lines 48-67).

17.   As to claim 48, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said search request comprises words within said text section of step (a) (Meske, Figs. 9 and 10, col. 10, line 41 – col. 11, line 5: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

18.   As to claim 49, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said search request comprises a plurality of words (Meske, Figs. 9 and 10, col. 10, line 41 – col. 11, line 5: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

19.   As to claim 50, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said search request comprises a synonym of at least one word in said text section (Sotomayor, col. 17, lines 5-18).

20.   As to claim 51, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said additional reading material is related to said section of text by discussion of identical concept (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

21.   As to claim 52, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said additional reading material is related to said section of text by discussion of concepts that are related to one another (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

22.   As to claim 53, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said concepts are considered related to one another when both are related to a third concept (Meske, Abstract: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

23.   As to claim 54, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said concepts are considered related to one another when one is included within the other (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

24.   As to claim 55, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index is an author's index to said requested text (Sotomayor, col. 17, line 50 – col. 18, line 36).

25.   As to claim 56, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index is generated automatically by a computer system (Sotomayor, Abstract).

26.   As to claim 57, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index is a search engine (Sotomayor, col. 35, lines 48-57).

27.   As to claim 58, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index is accessed via a computer network (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

28.   As to claim 59, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said display occurs in a browser window (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

29.   As to claim 60, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said indicator of additional reading material is an excerpt of said additional reading material (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

30.   As to claim 61, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the indicator of additional reading material is an index term (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

31.   As to claim 62, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the computer system obtains

input from the reader regarding the types of relationships between references to

concepts to provide information about in step (d) (Sotomayor, col. 6, lines 18-48).

32.   As to claim 63, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the computer system obtains

input from the reader regarding the strength of relationships between related concepts

to provide information about (Sotomayor, col. 6, lines 18-48).

33.   As to claim 64, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said indicator of additional

reading material is displayed on an outline of at least one text (Meske, Abstract and

Figs. 9-11: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a

plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and

the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup

language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow

hypertext viewing and accessing).

34.   As to claim 65, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index to be searched

may be selected by the reader (Sotomayor, col. 35, lines 48-57).

35.   As to claim 66, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein additional information

resident on the reader's computer influences said search request (Meske, Abstract and

Figs. 9-11: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a

plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and

the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup

language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow

hypertext viewing and accessing).

36.   As to claim 67, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said text requested by the

reader is obtained via a computer network (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

37.   Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sotomayor and Meske as applied to claims 36-41 and 43-69 above, and further in view

of Buguraev, Patent No. 6,212,494.

38.   As to claim 42, Sotomayor-Meske disclose the limitations as discussed above.

However, Sotomayor-Meske do not explicitly disclose wherein the method of

formulating said search request comprises analyzing the frequency with which at least

one word appears in said text section relative to other words.   Buguraev discloses a

method for creating a catalog comprising key terms, properties thereof, relations

involving those key terms for a given topic comprises clustering key terms on the basis

of proximity in terms of their relative position in the text (col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 48).

Since Buguraev teaches a method for creating a glossary, index, help database or the

like, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have incorporated the index method of Buguraev into the search

system of Sotomayor-Meske to include gathering key terms on the basis of proximity in terms of relative position in the text. By doing so, it would create an online help database useful in providing online assistance to users in performing a task.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306   (After Final Communications only)

(703) 872-9306   (Official Communications)

(703) 746-7240 (for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER